DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 745 UD 018 321

TITLE New York State Programs of Postsecondary Opportunity, 1975-76. Summary of Reports, Analysis, and Regents' Recommendations.
INSTITUTION New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 73p.; For related documents, see ED 111 918, ED 135 930, and ED 141 475

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Disadvantaged Youth; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Enrollment Rate; *Equal Education; *Higher Education; *Minority Groups; Post Secondary Education; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Reports; Socioeconomic Status; *Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *New York

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an analysis of the activities of the postsecondary opportunity programs in New York State. The four programs serving disadvantaged populations in 1975-76 were: College Discovery; Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge; the Educational Opportunity Program; and the Higher Education Opportunity Program. Approximately $33,928,000 was appropriated by the state of New York to serve a projected enrollment of 32,700 students in these four programs. The population served by the programs was nontraditional with 55% blacks and 22% Spanish origin students. All programs provided the students with a full range of remedial, developmental and supportive courses, tutoring and counseling. In 1975-76, the year in which there was an increase in language arts courses, the quality of student achievement was similar to that of the previous year. Financial support, however, was smaller for all programs in 1975-76. Recommendations are made in this report in the areas of enrollment patterns, funding, academic supportive services and employment opportunities for graduates. (Author/AM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED156745

NEW YORK STATE

PROGRAMS

OF

POSTSECONDARY OPPORTUNITY

1975-76

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N.Y. State Education Department

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Summary of Reports,

Analysis, and

Regents' Recommendations

UDO 18321

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY
AND COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

March 13, 1978

Dear Governor Carey:

In accordance with Section 6452 of the Education Law I submit to you this analysis of the activities of the postsecondary opportunity programs in the public and independent sectors for the academic year 1975-76. Late receipt of the public sectors' reports made it impossible for the combined report to be completed earlier.

The report makes recommendations in the areas of enrollment patterns, funding, academic supportive services, and employment opportunities for graduates.

The Regents, in approving this report for transmittal, wished to emphasize improvements in the opportunity programs, particularly noting that over 11,000 students had graduated as of 1976. These programs serve as a highly successful mechanism for the integration of the colleges and universities in New York State, with more than a third of all undergraduate minority students in New York State attending college through SEEK, College Discovery, EOP or HEOP. These students, many of whom are older and from groups with high unemployment rates, have now been enabled to enter the mainstream of the economic and social life of our State. I know you share my pride in their accomplishment.

Sincerely,

Gordon M. Ambach

The Honorable Hugh L. Carey
Governor of the State of New York
Executive Chamber
The Capitol
Albany, New York

Enc.

cc: Chancellor Theodore M. Black
Regent Willard A. Genrich
Legislative Leadership

NOT FOR RELEASE UNTIL AUTHORIZED

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

ALBANY, NEW YORK 12230

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR
HIGHER AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

February [illegible], 1978

RECEIVED
FEB 7 1978
SECRETARY TO THE
BOARD OF REGENTS

ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 1975-76 FROM THE
POSTSECONDARY OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

To the Commissioner of Education:

The Education Law gives to the Regents a number of oversight responsibilities with regard to the postsecondary opportunity programs. Among them is the requirement that the public universities provide the Regents with annual reports on the programs they administer, and that the Regents review these reports and forward that review, with their comments and recommendations, to the Governor and the Legislature. There is also a requirement that the Regents report annually on the status of the opportunity programs in both the public and independent sectors of postsecondary education.

For the past several years, staff have met these particular requirements by preparing a report which presents the status of programs in all the sectors based on the annual reports of each program, with comments and recommendations for improvement. The document before you is such a report for the 1975-76 academic year, for your review and approval for submission to the Governor and Legislature. The individual reports for 1975-76 are available for inspection upon request. This report was due to be transmitted on December 1, 1976, but late delivery of the 1975-76 annual reports from the state and city universities have delayed its preparation.

However, annual program plans submitted to the Department show that many of the problems the programs were encountering in the year reported on, remain. All of the recommendations, while based on the 1975-76 data, are applicable to the current situation.

After approval by the Regents, this document will be forwarded to the Governor and the Legislature in accordance with the Education Law.

RECOMMENDATION: I recommend that the Regents approve the document, New York State Postsecondary Opportunity Programs, 1975-76 and authorize its release.

Respectfully submitted,

Hadley S. DePuy

Approved

Commissioner of Education

Feb. 6, 1978

CONTENTS

I Foreword..... ii

II Abstract..... 1

III Enrollments..... 6

IV Student Characteristics..... 12

V Campus Programs..... 24

VI Program Staff..... 30

VII Program of Study..... 32

VIII Student Achievement..... 35

IX Program Financing..... 44

X Conclusion..... 61

XI Appendix - Participating Institutions..... 62

I FOREWORD

Since the mid-nineteen sixties, New York State has provided resources for extending educational opportunity to its disadvantaged citizens by supporting special education programs in postsecondary institutions throughout the state. The four separate programs which serve the needs of this target population are College Discovery (C.D.), Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK), the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and the Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP).

Legislation established College Discovery in the two-year colleges of New York City in 1964 and SEEK in the senior colleges in 1966. These two programs fall under the City University of New York, (CUNY) which is governed by the city's Board of Higher Education. The Office of Special Programs in CUNY, which has the function of coordinating and supervising the activities of both SEEK and CD, keeps the planning, financing and reporting functions of the two programs separate. College Discovery and SEEK are currently in a transitional period, awaiting new guidelines from the Board of Higher Education to improve the administrative and programmatic aspects of both operations.

The Educational Opportunity Programs, established in 1967, are part of the State University of New York (SUNY) which is governed by its own Board of Trustees. This sector provides all public postsecondary education outside the City of New York and administers one institution within the City, Fashion Institute of Technology. Opportunity programs exist in most State University components. An Office of Special Programs in the University's central administration coordinates and supervises EOP plans, reports and activities.

The Higher Education Opportunity Programs, established in 1969, operate in many independent institutions of higher learning throughout the state. The State Education Department, acting on behalf of the Board of Regents, funds and administers the program in both two-year and four-year institutions.

In order to insure that the diversity and the autonomy of the governing bodies of New York's opportunity programs would not hinder the coordination of policies and activities, the legislature enacted section 6452 of the Education Law which directed the Board of Regents to review the plans and reports from all sectors and to make comments and recommendations for improvements in the programs.

This report, which displays and compares data from all sectors, is submitted in compliance with that requirement of the law.

II ABSTRACT

For over a decade New York State has extended opportunities in higher education to those who have been academically and economically disadvantaged by supporting opportunity programs in institutions in the public and independent sectors. These programs, Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge, (SEEK), College Discovery, (CD), the Educational Opportunity Program,(EOP), and the Higher Education Opportunity Program, (HEOP) have assisted disadvantaged students in acquiring degrees by permitting extra time for completion of requirements, and by providing financial support and special academic aids, such as remedial courses, tutoring and counseling.

In 1975-76 New York State appropriated $33,928,000 to serve a projected enrollment of 32,700 students in these four programs. The actual headcount equalled 34,868,and the full-time equivalent enrollment was 31,109.8 students.

Of the 34,868,about 12,600 were freshmen. Over 62% of these came from families having incomes smaller than $5,530,and about 78% had high school averages under 80%.

A comparison of all programs reveals that students in EOP in the community colleges had the smallest incomes and that students in College Discovery had the lowest academic averages.

The population served by all programs was nontraditional. About 55% were black and 22% were of Spanish origin. The Higher Education Opportunity Program enrolled the highest proportion of blacks, and College Discovery the highest proportion of those with Spanish surnames. Over 56% of all enrollees were over 21, and female. EOP in the community colleges had the highest proportion over 21 and SEEK had the highest ratio of women.

All programs provided the students with a full range of remedial, developmental and supportive courses, tutoring and counseling. In 1975-76 there was an

increase in the proportion of special courses devoted to language arts in all programs. The Higher Education Opportunity Program provided the greatest number of hours of tutoring per student and involved a higher proportion of its student population in this activity than any other program. HEOP provided the most extensive counseling services with the richest counselor-student ratio.

In 1975-76 the quality of student achievement was similar to that of the previous year. The graduation and credit earning rates improved slightly over 1974-75 for most programs, with SEEK and College Discovery improving substantially in the latter category.

Financial support was smaller for all programs in 1975-76. There was a 14% reduction in the opportunity allocations coupled with 4% increase in the planned enrollments. Because of grant reductions and a rise in costs, institutions were unable to increase either financial aid or supportive services to program students, although both were needed.

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Because programs experience difficulties in attaining and maintaining projected enrollments, appropriations, especially those for supportive services, should not be rigidly tied to one enrollment figure. An enrollment range, consisting of a specific quota plus or minus a given tolerance, would be most practical. (Chapter III, p. 8)

Recommendation 2: Students in HEOP perform well by most measures. The percent of opportunity students allocated to this program should more closely approximate the percent of the regular college population served by independent institutions. (Chapter III, p. 8)

Recommendation 3: Instead of small increments in program size, the process of determining enrollment goals should include a survey to establish the size of the eligible population desiring a college education. (Chapter III, p. 8)

Recommendation 4: Since evidence supporting the effectiveness of summer prefreshman activities exists, all programs, especially those in the public sector, should provide these services by reallocating existing resources, if necessary. (Chapter III, p. 11)

Recommendation 5: Because of the history of underenrollment in the spring semester, programs should receive permission to overenroll in the fall semester in order to offset the large number of dropouts occurring between semesters. (Chapter III, p. 11)

Recommendation 6: Currently, EOP appropriations only provide student financial aid in the community colleges and minimal supportive services for College Discovery. Because students attending community colleges in the public sector are the most severely disadvantaged of all, it is especially important that good academic supportive services be available to them. Additional program funds for such services are needed. (Chapter III, p. 11)

Recommendation 7: In light of the increase in the enrollments of students with Spanish surnames, programs should provide counseling and language arts courses specially designed for a bilingual population. (Chapter IV, p. 23)

Recommendation 8: SEEK should investigate recent shifts in the ethnic make-up of its population. (Chapter IV, p. 23)

Recommendation 9: Those programs experiencing difficulty in attracting and retaining black male students should examine the causes of this trend. (Chapter IV, p. 23)

Recommendation 10: Because tutoring is an essential requirement for meeting the needs of academically disadvantaged students, campus personnel should provide this service from whatever funds are available, even lacking direct opportunity program support. (Chapter V, p. 26)

Recommendation 11: All programs do provide a substantial portion of their enrollments with some counselor contact. However since the student counselor ratio in the public sector is so high, the effectiveness of this activity is diminished. Campus administrators should increase the availability of these services by increasing the number of counselors, thereby reducing the student: counselor ratio. (Chapter V, p. 29)

Recommendation 12: As opportunity programs expand, they will require additional special services for disadvantaged students. The academic community should give increased attention to the role and training of professionals serving these programs. (Chapter VI, p. 31)

Recommendation 13: Increasing enrollments in such fields as health, biology and business should be encouraged because disadvantaged minorities will find excellent opportunities for employment and career enhancement there. (Chapter VII, p. 34)

Recommendation 14: Financial aid available to the students in the various opportunity programs in every case is insufficient; gaps remain between resources (including the students' own contributions) and needs. Further, amounts contributed by students vary widely among the sectors. Program funding should be adjusted to eliminate the gaps between need and aid and to equalize the amounts disadvantaged students are expected to contribute to their education. (Chapter IX, p. 52)

Recommendation 15: The State should regularly adjust amounts available to programs for supportive academic services in order to offset inflation and other justifiable cost increases. (Chapter IX, p. 54)

III ENROLLMENTS

Enrollment Size

When the Legislature appropriates funds for the opportunity programs, it establishes the maximum number of students each program may support.

Table 1 displays the maximum projected enrollments for both 1974-75 and 1975-76 and shows that all programs with the exception of the Higher Education Opportunity Program received increased quotas for the 1975-76 school year.

The average growth rate for those receiving increases was 5.8%. The average growth rate across all programs was 4.8%.

Table 1

Opportunity Program Growth, 1974-75 to 1975-76

	Projected Enrollment in 1974-75	1975-76	Difference	Percent Growth Rate
SEEK	10,700	11,400	700	6.5
HEOP	5,300	5,300	0	0
EOP State	7,600	7,800	200	2.6
Community	3,000	3,300	300	10.0
College Discovery	4,600	4,900	300	6.5
TOTALS For All Programs	31,200	32,700	1,500	4.8

In 1975-76 the total enrollment projected for all programs was 32,700 students. For each program to attain its projected quota exactly was very difficult because of student attrition and delays in the final determination of quotas. Table 2, which compares the actual full-time equivalent enrollment with the 1975-76 projected enrollment for each program, shows that the average rate of underenrollment for all programs was 4.9%.

Table 2

Projected Enrollment Versus Actual Enrollment
in Opportunity Programs, 1975-76

	Projected Enrollment	Actual Enrollment in FTE[1]	Difference	Percent Difference
SEEK	11,400	10,627.5	772.5	- 6.8
HEOP	5,300	5,207.9	92.1	- 1.7
EOP State	7,800	7,609.1	190.9	- 2.4
Community	3,300	3,368.3	68.3	+ 2.0
College Discovery	4,900	4,297[2]	603	-12.3
TOTAL	32,700	31,109.8	1,590.2	- 4.9

[1] FTE = Full Time Equivalent

[2] Average of Headcounts for Fall and Spring Semesters - not FTE.

In 1975-76 the total actual full-time equivalent enrollment for all four programs was 31,109.8 students. Of this number, SEEK had 34.2%; College Discovery - 13.8%, EOP State operated schools - 24.5%, EOP community colleges - 10.8% and HEOP - 16.7%.

Although independent colleges and universities accounted for about 34% of all undergraduate enrollment in the State, HEOP, operating in independent institutions, enrolled 16.7% of the target population.

While the opportunity programs are helping a substantial number of disadvantaged students, there are many eligible persons for whom there is no room. The entering freshman class for all programs has room for only about 30% of those needing assistance.[1]

[1] Annual Report New York State Opportunity Programs 1974-75, p 18.

Recommendation 1: Because programs experience difficulties in attaining and maintaining projected enrollments, appropriations, especially those for supportive services, should not be rigidly tied to one enrollment figure. An enrollment range, consisting of a specific quota plus or minus a given tolerance, would be most practical.

Recommendation 2: Students in HEOP perform well by most measures. The percent of opportunity students allocated to this program should more closely approximate the percent of the regular college population served by independent institutions.

Recommendation 3: Instead of small increments in program size, the process of determining enrollment goals should include a survey to establish the size of the eligible population desiring a college education.

Enrollment Patterns

Fall and spring are the periods of greatest activity and highest enrollment on all campuses.

Enrollment in the summer varies widely from program to program as Table 3 indicates.

SEEK and College Discovery do not formally admit students in the summer term. However, they permit students entering in the fall to take courses the summer before formal entry into college. These students and continuing students constitute the summer enrollments shown by the CUNY programs.

Table 3

Enrollment by Term, 1975-76 Headcount

	Summer	Fall	Winter	Spring	Summer as % of Fall Enrollment	Winter as % of Spring Enrollment
SEEK	2,908	9,798	- -	9,653	29.7	- -
HEOP	1,870	5,218	546	5,017	35.8	10.9
EOP State Community	723 576	7,834 3,543	243 132	7,426 3,512	9.2 16.3	3.3 3.8
College Discovery	1,851	4,699		3,895	39.4	- -
TOTAL	7,928	31,092	921	29,503	25.5	3.1

In contrast, the EOP programs show a relatively small proportion of their students in summer classes. Those who do attend appear to be mostly continuing students.

The Higher Education Opportunity, which also provides summer instruction for both continuing students and prefreshman, actively encourages new students to participate in special instructional activities before regular college classes begin. The effect of this policy is that more than half of each freshman class starts in

the summer and that more than half of each summer enrollment consists of pre-freshmen.

Winter is the semester showing least activity with many individual campuses such as CUNY scheduling no classes at all. Even where programs are run, no more than 11% of the regular enrollment participates.

Another trend which is obvious from a comparison of enrollments is that for all programs spring enrollments are smaller than the fall's. Two factors affect the size of this decrease: student attrition in the fall and the number of admissions for the spring semester. Table 4 shows the net effect of these two factors combined, for each individual program. EOP Community Colleges show the smallest decline while College Discovery shows the greatest.

Table 4

Comparison of Fall and Spring Enrollments 1975-76

	Change in Enrollment Fall to Spring	Percent Change
SEEK	- 145	- 1.5
HEOP	- 201	- 3.9
EOP-State	- 408	- 5.2
EOP-Community	- 31	- .9
College Discovery	- 804	-17.1
Net Spring Decrease	- 1,589	- 5.1

Recommendation 4: Since evidence supporting the effectiveness of summer prefreshman activities exists, all programs, especially those in the public sector, should provide these services by reallocating existing resources, if necessary.

Recommendation 5: Because of the history of underenrollment in the spring semester, programs should receive permission to overenroll in the fall semester in order to offset the large number of dropouts occurring between semesters.

Recommendation 6: Currently, EOP appropriations only provide student financial aid in the community colleges and minimal supportive services for College Discovery. Because students attending community colleges in the public sector are the most severely disadvantaged of all, it is especially important that good academic supportive services be available to them. Additional program funds for such services are needed.

IV STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The opportunity programs in New York State have been designed to help economically and academically disadvantaged students to earn college degrees. All applicants for these programs must meet the economic and academic criteria approved by the Board of Regents.

Economic

Table 5 displays the economic eligibility scale in effect during 1975-76.

TABLE 5

Economic Eligibility Criteria for Opportunity Programs for Entering Students, 1975-76

Number of Members in Household (including Head of Household)	January 1, 1974 to December 31, 1974 Gross Income	With Two Workers or One Worker Who is the Sole Support of a One Parent Family
1	$ 4,160	
2	5,528	$ 6,628
3	7,046	8,046
4	8,455	9,455
5	9,756	10,756
6	10,948	11,948
7	12,032	13,032
8	13,008	14,008
9	13,875	14,875
10	14,634	15,634

The above figures do not include the student's income unless he/she is the head of the household or the second worker supporting the household.

Students whose incomes exceed the economic guidelines may still enroll in a program, if they can demonstrate serious mismanagement of family funds with little accruing to the educational needs of the students. This mismanagement must be documented by written statements from reliable disinterested persons.

However, no more than 15% of the freshmen enrolled in any year may belong in this category.

Table 6

Percent Distribution of Entering Opportunity Students by Gross Family Income, 1975-76

	0-4160	4161 5528	5529 7046	7047 8455	8456 9756	9757 10,948	10,949 12,032	12,033 13,008	13,009 13,875	Over 13,875
SEEK	38.0	17.2	16.0	10.4	7.9	4.6	2.4	1.1	.8	1.6
HEOP	49.2	14.3	13.6	10.0	6.4	2.4	1.6	1.1	.3	1.1
EOP										
STATE	48.8	13.2	12.4	8.8	6.9	3.4	2.6	1.8	.4	1.7
COMMUNITY	57.2	15.3	10.2	6.9	4.0	2.9	1.3	.8	.9	.5
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	41.3	18.3	14.7	10.7	6.2	3.8	2.0	1.1	.8	1.1
MEAN	46.7	15.5	13.4	9.3	6.4	3.5	2.1	1.2	.6	1.3

Table 7

Cumulative Percent Distribution of Entering Opportunity Students by Gross Family Income

	0-4160	4161 - 8455	8456 - 12032	12033++
SEEK	38.0	81.6	96.5	100
HEOP	49.2	87.1	97.5	100
EOP				
STATE	48.8	83.2	96.1	100
COMMUNITY	57.2	89.6	97.8	100
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	41.3	85.0	97.0	100

Table 6 displays the percent distribution of entering opportunity students by gross family income for 1975-76, and Table 7 presents the same data on a cumulated basis.

Almost 97% of the students in all programs had incomes smaller than $12,032. An analysis of individual programs reveals that the Education Opportunity Programs at SUNY's community colleges enrolled the poorest students with 57.2% having incomes under $4,160 and 97.8% having incomes under $12,032.

Students from families receiving Social Service funds, who are wards of the State or county, or who are living with foster parents with no parental aid, need not meet the economic criteria in order to enroll in a program.

Table 8

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Students[1] by Number in Household, Marital Status and Benefits Received, 1975-76

	% OF MEMBERS IN HOUSEHOLD			%	VA	Social	Social
	One (independent)	2-4	5+	Married	Benefits	Services	Security
SEEK	9.7	50.6	39.7	4.7	2.9	31.7	11.4
HEOP	24.1	45.1	30.8	4.5	1.7	19.0	4.4
EOP							
State	25.0	40.3	34.7	5.7	3.7	9.4	7.7
Community	34.3	40.7	25.0	13.7	7.2	28.1	5.4
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	10.7	53.3	36.0	5.2	4.7	32.2	13.1
MEAN	20.7	45.6	33.7	6.7	4.0	21.1	8.4

[1] Entering Students

Table 8 shows that 32.2% of the students enrolling for the first time in the College Discovery program came from families receiving Social Service funds. This was 11.1 percentage points greater than the average.

However the percent of all opportunity students receiving Social Service funds in 75-76 was 4.1 percentage points lower than in 74-75.

Table 8 also displays the percent of students by number in household. Only the SEEK Program showed a substantial change from 74-75 with the number of freshmen who were "independent" dropping from 25.6% of the entrants to 9.7%. The program showing an increase in the "independent" category was the Education Opportunity Program.

In general opportunity program students belong to low income families who frequently rely on funds from Social Service. One in five of these is listed as independent which means they receive no financial support from their families at all.

Academic

Applicants for opportunity programs meet the academic criteria for admission if they are nonadmissible by usually applied admissions standards to any regular academic program at a particular institution. Types of diploma, high school averages, and standardized scores, which serve as indicators of past high school performance, identify the student as normally inadmissible to an institution.

Table 9 displays the percent distribution of opportunity students for three common indicators of high school achievement: high school average, class rank and type of diploma.

The Educational Opportunity Programs in the community colleges enrolled the highest percent of students with high school averages below 80%, and with non academic diplomas. College Discovery enrolled the greatest percent with high school averages below 70% and with high school class rank in the three lowest quintiles.

Table 9

Summary Table of Entering Freshmen, 1975-76

	A	B	C	D	E	F
	Below 80% Average	Below 70% Average	Lower Three Quintiles	Non-Academic Diploma	No Diploma	GED
SEEK	78.8	33.5	NA	NA	NA	9.5
HEOP	68.7	15.7	70.5	27.6	5.1	18.2
EOP						
STATE	72.1	11.5	65.1	18.0	5.3	10.7
COMMUNITY	90.0	27.1	41.5	33.3	9.5	21.5
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	86.4	35.8	72.1	NA	NA	NA
MEAN	78.4	24.7	60.5	25.2	6.8	14.0

A. Percent of opportunity students with average high school grade below 80%.
B. Percent of opportunity students with diplomas who have average high school grade below 70%.
C. Percent opportunity students in the lower three quintiles of their graduating high school class.
D. Percent opportunity students who graduated from high school with a non-academic diploma.
E. No diploma.
F. General Equivalency Diploma.
G. NA = Not available.

However, there was a smaller proportion of students in categories A to D (see Table 9) in 1975-76 than in 74-75. Only the categories "No Diploma" and GED showed an increase.

The other measures of school achievement, the SAT scores, were available only for students in EOP and in HEOP and are shown on Table 10.

Table 10

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Students Entering in 1975-76
By SAT Verbal & Math Scores

	MATH 560+	380-559	320-379	260-319	Below 260
HEOP	2.2	44.2	27.6	20.0	6.0
EOP-STATE	3.6	44.2	22.9	19.8	9.5
EOP-COMMUNITY	1.0	38.3	25.9	25.9	8.9
	VERBAL 560+	380-559	320-379	260-319	Below 260
HEOP	1.0	32.5	30.0	23.4	13.1
EOP-STATE	1.0	36.5	26.8	21.0	14.7
EOP-COMMUNITY	.3	37.6	26.6	22.5	13.0

For the mathematics scores, the distributions for HEOP and EOP in the State operated schools were very similar with HEOP having 54% of students below 380 and EOP-State operated having 52% in that same category. In contrast almost 61% of the entrants into the EOP community college programs had Math SAT scores below 380.

In the case of the tests of verbal ability almost 62% of the students in EOP on all levels had scores under 380, while almost 67% of HEOP students were in this class.

A comparison of the 75-76 and 74-75 SAT scores for both mathematics and verbal skills reveals fluctuations of less than five percentage points with one exception: the percent of students from the Educational Opportunity Program in the community colleges having an SAT verbal skills score less than 380 decreased by 12.8 percentage points from 74-75 to 75-76.

While 50% of college bound seniors across the nation had SAT mathematics scores below 475, 55% of opportunity program students were below 380. While 50% of the regular colleged bound seniors had verbal scores below 425, 64% of program students fell below 380.[1]

A composite picture of the economic and academic characteristics of entering freshmen shows that the most disadvantaged students in all categories were those enrolled in the Education Opportunity Programs in the community colleges and in College Discovery.

[1]Educational Testing Service

Ethnic Characteristics

Although students in opportunity programs are very similar in their economic and academic characteristics, they display somewhat greater diversity in their ethnic characteristics. Students from many ethnic groups are represented in all programs; Blacks, Native Americans, Orientals, students with Spanish surnames, Whites and others.

Table 11 shows that of all the programs operating in 1975-76, HEOP had the highest proportion of black students and College Discovery the highest proportion of Spanish surnamed students.

Table 11

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Program Students According to Ethnicity, 1975-76

	Black	Native American	Oriental	Spanish Surnamed	Sub Total	White	Other	Total
SEEK	55.4	0	3.4	31.3	90.1	5.4	4.5	100
HEOP	59.4	1.6	1.6	19.4	82.0	16.8	1.2	100
EOP								
STATE	55.7	1.4	1.6	11.5	70.2	27.7	2.1	100
COMMUNITY	54.0	.9	.3	7.1	62.3	37.6	.1	100
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	44.6	.1	1.7	40.4	86.8	11.9	1.3	100
MEAN for State	54.5	.8	2.0	22.4	79.7	18.0	2.3	100

A comparison of the 75-76 data with those from 74-75 shows that the percent of "minority" enrollments has increased by one percentage point. Further comparisons reveal that all programs with the exception of EOP showed a decrease in the proportion of black students. In the case of SEEK this decrease was 5.7 percentage points. For HEOP and College Discovery the decrease was smaller than 5 percentage points. HEOP, EOP in the community colleges, and College Discovery showed an increase in the proportion of students with Spanish surnames.

Table 12

Minority Student Enrollment By Sector
Fall 74 as Compared to Fall 75

	Black	Native American	Oriental	Spanish Surnamed	Total HC Enrollment Minorities
SEEK Fall 74	6342	10	228	3181	9761
Fall 75	5933	0	364	3352	9649
COLLEGE DISCOVERY					
Fall 74	2163	9	522	1654	4348
Fall 75	2141	5	83	1941	4170
EOP STATE Fall 74	4163	104	82	891	5240
Fall 75	4772	122	135	986	6015
EOP COMMUNITY					
Fall 74	1890	24	7	277	2198
Fall 75	2425	42	14	319	2800
HEOP Fall 74	3226	84	94	872	4276
Fall 75	3727	103	100	1211	5141
TOTALS FALL 74	17,784	231	933	6875	25,823
OPPORTUNITY FALL 75 PROGRAM	18,998	272	696	7809	27,775

An examination of actual enrollment figures reported on Table 12 for 74-75 and 75-76 shows that only SEEK and College Discovery experienced declines in the number of blacks enrolled. HEOP, which showed a decrease in the proportion of blacks, actually had an increase in black enrollment. All programs registered actual increases in the enrollments of Spanish surnamed students. These increases were not always reflected as percent increases, because the total numbers of blacks and Spanish surnamed students who are

enrolled in regular programs in post secondary institutions have been increasing since 1974.[1] In fact, the percent of minority students enrolled in full time undergraduate programs in both the public and independent sectors has increased since the Fall of 74.[2] About 31% of this minority enrollment is attributable to the opportunity programs.

Table 13

Full time Undergraduate Enrollment of Minority Students in Postsecondary Institutions of the Public and Independent Sectors as a Percent of the Total Full Time Undergraduate Enrollment in the Postsecondary Institutions of Public and Independent Sectors

	Fall 1974			Fall 1976[3]		
Sector	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	%	Minority Enrollment	Total Enrollment	%
Public	63,175	328,924	19.2	72,609	328,477	22.1
Independent	16,276	174,447	9.3	24,853[4]	209,670	11.9
Total	79,451	503,371	15.8	97,462	538,147	18.1

Age

Opportunity programs tend to serve students who are on the average older than the regular college student.

Table 14

Sex and Age Summary of Opportunity Students, 1975-76

	% Under 21	% 21-25	% Above 25	% Male	% Female
SEEK	49.6	37.9	12.5	36.2	63.8
HEOP	38.2	36.4	25.4	48.5	51.5
EOP					
STATE	41.6	39.5	18.9	49.1	50.9
COMMUNITY	30.3	35.8	33.9	47.5	52.5
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	55.9	31.0	13.1	37.8	62.2
MEAN	43.9	36.8	19.3	43.3	56.7

1 Ethnic distribution for all postsecondary enrollments reported SED for Fall 1974 and Fall 1976. No Data Available for Fall 75

2 Op. Cit.

Table 14, which displays the student distribution by age, shows that about 56% of students in all programs were above 21 years of age. A program by program comparison reveals that EOP in the community colleges enrolled the oldest students, with almost 70% over 21. HEOP and EOP were second and third with proportions close to 60% over 21 and SEEK was fourth with slightly more than 50% over 21. College Discovery enrolled the youngest population, almost 56% under 21. The ages of the students enrolled in programs in 75-76 were only slightly younger than those enrolled in 74-75.

Sex

Table 14 also displays the distribution of students by sex. Slightly more than half of the students in HEOP and EOP were women, while SEEK and College Discovery enrolled over 60% women.

Recommendation 7: In light of the increase in the enrollments of students with Spanish surnames, programs should provide counseling and language arts courses specially designed for a bilingual population.

Recommendation 8: SEEK should investigate recent shifts in the ethnic makeup of its population.

Recommendation 9: Those programs experiencing difficulty in attracting and retaining black male students should examine the causes of this trend.

V CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Three elements characterizing opportunity programs relate directly to the students' academic programs: remedial/developmental/supportive (R/D/S) courses, tutoring and counseling.

Remedial/developmental/supportive courses

Remedial and supportive instruction includes credit and noncredit courses in writing and composition, reading, basic mathematics, science and study skills. These classes which are taught by campus specialists who are acquainted with the special learning problems of the disadvantaged, have as their goal the development of those basic skills usually acquired in high school or elementary school.

Developmental courses are different in that they combine precollege and college-level material in specific subject areas. Regular college faculty teach these particular subjects which meet more frequently than normal college courses.

Table 15

Remedial, Developmental and Supportive Courses
Distribution Among Opportunity Students By Subject Area

	SEEK	HEOP	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery
RDS SUBJECT AREA (%)					
Language Arts	54.1	43.3	41.3	32.3	48.8
Study Skills	5.1	5.8	10.6	9.8	5.0
Other & Social Sciences	19.4	21.2	20.4	11.2	8.7
Math & Physical Science	21.4	29.7	27.7	46.7	37.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 15 displays the distribution of remedial/developmental/supportive courses for each opportunity program in 75-76. A comparison of these data with those for 74-75 shows an increase in language arts courses in all sectors.

Tutoring

Whenever students need more specialized or individualized instruction than that available from R/D/S courses, they may avail themselves of tutoring services.

Table 16

Distribution of Tutoring Services to Opportunity Students 1975-76

	SEEK	HEOP	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery	TOTALS
Tutoring Hours	83,016	143,979	92651	14384	17,971	352,001
Total number of students tutored	3,480	3,264	4,359	1719	1338*	14160
a) Percent Lower Division	80.0	77.6	78.9	100.0	100	83
b) Percent Upper Division	20.0	22.4	21.1	-----	0	17
Average Number of Hours Received	23.8	44.1	21.3	8.4	13.4	24.9
Percent of Total Enrolled Receiving Tutoring	32.5	52.1	50.9	38.3	27.9	40.6

*Data Missing from Borough of Manhattan and Queensboro.

Table 16 shows the distribution of tutoring services to opportunity students. In 75-76 HEOP provided the greatest number of tutoring hours per student and the programs in the community colleges, the least. Students in the lower division or the first two years of college received the most tutoring. On the average almost 41% of the students enrolled received tutoring.

Recommendation 10: Because tutoring is an essential requirement for meeting the needs of academically disadvantaged students, campus personnel should provide this service from whatever funds are available, even lacking direct opportunity program support.

The range of student participation extended from almost 28% in the College Discovery Program to 52% in HEOP.

Tutors may be either professionals or undergraduates who are proficient in their studies. Several benefits arise from the use of undergraduate tutors.

1. They are very likely to empathize with fellow classmates.
2. They themselves receive reinforcement of their knowledge.
3. They produce excellent results in a cost effective way.

Table 17

Percent Distribution of Tutors By Level
For All Opportunity Programs For 75-76

LEVEL OF TUTOR	SEEK	HEOP	EOP State operated	EOP-Community College	College Discovery
Undergraduate	71.3	66.7	73.4	83.2	67.9
Graduate	20.7	20.7	22.5	3.6	10.7
Professional & Other	8.0	12.6	4.1	13.2	21.4
Paid	78.7	100	97.3	83.2	79.5
Voluntary	21.3	0	2.7	16.8	20.5

Table 17, which presents the percent distribution of tutors by level for all opportunity programs for 75-76, shows that all programs used undergraduate tutors more than any others.

Counseling

Because students in opportunity programs come from such disadvantaged backgrounds, they need a wide variety of counseling services.

Table 18 displays the counseling services provided by each program. HEOP employed the greatest number of counselors and had the lowest student counselor ratio.

Table 18

Counseling Services to Opportunity Students 1975-76

For Academic Year

	SEEK	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery	HEOP
Total no. of all counselors FTE	180	137	59.1	85.4	195.9
Total no. of students served	10355	8568	3850	4800	6267
Contacts as percent of total enrolled	96.6	100	85	100	100
Student:counselor ratio	57.5	62.5	65.1	56.2	32.0**

** Includes counseling by administrators and peer counselors

Data show that in 75-76 more than 85 percent of the total enrollment in all programs had counseling services available to them.

Table 19

Rank Order of Counseling Contacts By Purpose, 1975-76

	SEEK	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery	HEOP
Educational	1	1	1	1	1
Personal & Social	2	2	2	2	2
Financial	4	3	3	3	3
Placement-Vocational and Educational	3	4	4	4	4
Psychological	5	5	6	5	5
Other	6	6	5	6	6

Table 19 shows that the rank order of counseling contacts by purpose was similar for all programs. Counselors assisted with educational and personal problems most frequently, with financial and vocational concerns following closely.

Recommendation 11: All programs do provide a substantial portion of their enrollments with some counselor contact. However since the student counselor ratio in the public sector is so high, the effectiveness of this activity is diminished. Campus administrators should increase the availability of these services by increasing the number of counselors, thereby reducing the student: counselor ratio.

VI. PROGRAM STAFF

The purpose of opportunity programs is to assist students in obtaining regular degrees by fulfilling regular college requirements. To reach this goal each institution employs specialists, whose attitudes and skills enable them to deal effectively with the problems faced by disadvantaged students.

These professionals, who work in this area, function in both administrative and academic roles. The former includes directors and assistant directors. The latter comprises teachers, counselors and tutors.

Table 20

Opportunity Program Staff (FTE)

	SEEK	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery	HEOP	TOTALS
Administrators	84	38.3	17.5	11.5	88.0	239.3
Counselors	190	75.9	20.0	70.4	70.9	427.2
Teachers	237	36.9	13.9	191.3	83.0	562.1
Tutors-Professionals	---	8.0	1.7	57.3	6.6	73.6
Tutors-Counselors	4	4.5	3.9	1.0	4.2	17.6
TOTALS	515	163.6	57.0	331.5	252.7	1319.8

Table 20 displays the distribution of administrative and academic staff for each program. Almost 82% of these staff members provided academic services. The total number of staff members in 75-76 is 7% smaller than in 74-75.

Recommendation 12: As opportunity programs expand, they will require additional special services for disadvantaged students. The academic community should give increased attention to the role and training of professionals serving these programs.

VII PROGRAM OF STUDY

Tables 21 and 22 display the major concentration of studies chosen by students in two and four year programs.

Table 21

Major Subject Area of Study For Opportunity Students Enrolled in Associate Degree Programs, 1975-76 By Percent

Major Subject	HEOP 2 yrs.	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery
Business & Commerce	13.6	21.3	19.1	25.8
Data Processing	1.3	2.5	.6	6.0
Health Sciences	2.5	10.0	7.0	13.4
Natural Sciences	.8	8.4	1.4	3.5
Public Service	19.3	10.5	10.4	4.5
Other Occupations	5.4	25.1	5.1	7.7
Liberal Arts	55.5	10.0	35.7	37.8
Undeclared	1.6	12.2	20.7	1.3
TOTAL	100	100	100	100.0

Students enrolled in two-year programs of HEOP, EOP in the community colleges and College Discovery chose liberal arts as their major course of study more frequently than any other course. Students enrolled in two year Education Opportunity Program in SUNY's Agricultural and Technical Colleges, which are State operated chose a variety of courses categorized as "other". The major change from 74-75 was that liberal arts moved from second to first place in the HEOP listing.

This indicates that most HEOP students intend to go on for two more years.

For each of the four year programs, Table 22 presents the rank order of major areas of study.

Table 22

Rank Order of Major Areas of Study For Upper Division Students in 4 or 5 Year Bachelor Degree Programs, 1975-76

RANK	SEEK	HEOP	EOP
1	Social Sciences	Social Sciences	Social Sciences
2	Education	Bus. & Mgt.	Education
3	Health Prof.	Psychology	Interdisciplinary
4	Business	Education	Business & Mgt.
5	Psychology	Biology	Health

National Rank Order For 1972

1	2	3-4	5
Business and Commerce	Education	Biological and Health Sciences/ Social Sciences	Humanities

The Social Sciences were first in each instance. A comparison with the 74-75 data shows that courses such as health professions, psychology and biology were increasing in popularity.

Project directors, counselors and placement personnel specializing in the disadvantaged report that, for minority students in the latter - mentioned majors "hard sciences" and business, job opportunities with good career possibilities are numberous. Education Department staff intend to conduct a more systematic review of employment opportunities for opportunity program graduates in the near future.

Recommendation 13: Increasing enrollments in such fields as health, biology and business should be encouraged because disadvantaged minorities will find excellent opportunities for employment and career enhancement there.

VIII STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A college degree, the most tangible reward for all opportunity program students, is the most important indicator of success. There are, however, other measures which demonstrate interim achievement, and predict graduation: grade point averages, credit accumulation, and retention and separation rates.

Grade point averages

The grade point average, a numerical code indicating the quality of a student's work, may range from 0 (failure) to 4.0 (A or 100%). Table 23 presents the distribution of opportunity students in all programs by grade point averages.

Table 23

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Students

By Grade Point Average

GPA Range	SEEK	HEOP		EOP		College[1] Discovery	All Prog.
		4 year	2 yr.	State	Community		
00-.99	12.8	18.6	21.2	14.4	21.4	19.4	16.3
1.0-1.9	28.0	22.4	12.7	26.7	24.2	25.0	25.6
2.0-2.9	45.5	39.4	38.4	45.9	37.2	36.6	42.0
3.0-4.0	13.7	19.6	27.7	13.0	17.2	18.9	16.1

[1]Because of method of computation, these figures cannot be compared with 74-75 for CD.

In general, 58.1% of the students had a grade of "C" or better. Only 16.3% were failing. The distribution of students' grade point averages for 1975-76 remained similar to that for 1974-75 with one exception.

In 75-76, the Higher Education Opportunity Program in four year institutions reported that the proportion of students in the 0-.99 range had increased by 9 percentage points. Achievement reports for later years indicate that this disturbing increase has been reduced.

Credit Accumulation

In order for students to graduate within the time allotted, and to meet institutional benchmarks for continued matriculation, they must earn credits at a consistent and timely rate.

Tables 24 and 25 compare the distribution of the student population for each program by term of entry, by number of semesters in college and by credits accumulated toward a degree. Similarities among the distributions for HEOP and EOP indicate that students have accumulated credits at a rate which will permit graduation within the time allotted. Data for the SEEK program show that the percent of students with an accumulation of 72 credits or fewer exceeded the percent of students whose length of enrollment would normally place them at that level of credit accumulation. To put it another way, since 34.3% of students in SEEK have attended college for fewer than three semesters, about the same proportion of students should have credit accumulations ranging from 0-24. The fact that a larger percent had this small credit accumulation indicates that students who had been in classes for three or more semesters were earning credits at an unsatisfactory rate. This excess was greatest in the first year. A similar situation appeared in the College Discovery program for students with 48 credits or less. A comparison of the 1975-76 and 1974-75 figures for these two programs shows that first year SEEK students have improved their credit earning rate 5 percentage points and

Table 24

Status of Opportunity Students in

Baccalaureate Degree Programs, 1975-76 [1]

DISTRIBUTION OF 1975-76 ENROLLEES	SEEK	HEOP	EOP
By Date of Entry			
1975-76	19.5	32.1	NOT AVAILABLE
1974-75	34.0	22.0	
1973-74	20.1	19.3	
1972-73	12.8	16.8	
1971-72	7.3	5.8	
1970-71	4.0	2.2	
1969-70	2.2	1.0	
Before 1969		.8	
By Number of Semesters in College			
1-2	34.3	32.3	34.2
3-4	29.3	22.9	25.9
5-6	18.0	20.4	17.8
7-8	10.3	15.1	14.5
9-10+	8.0	9.3	7.6
By Credits Accumulated Toward Degree			
0-24	47.4	27.4	29.7
25-48	23.0	23.4	24.7
49-72	13.0	17.2	17.4
73-96	8.0	13.4	13.1
97-120 +	8.6	18.6	15.1

[1] Percent Distribution

Table 25

Status of Opportunity Students in Associate Degree Programs, 1975-76[1]

By Date of Entry	HEOP Two-year	EOP Community College	College Discovery
1975-76	56.3		30.6
1974-75	24.7		37.5
1973-74	13.5	NOT AVAILABLE	22.9
1972-73	3.6		6.0
1971-72	1.3		2.1
1970-71	.6		.7
1969-70	0		.2
By Number of Semesters in College			
1-2	53.5	57.3	32.5
3-4	22.5	28.6	38.0
5-6+	24.0	14.1	29.5
By Credit Accumulation Toward Degree			
0-24	57.6	59.0	46.6
25-48	24.2	24.6	30.9
49-72+	18.2	16.4	22.5

[1]Percent Distribution

that College Discovery Freshman have improved by 31 percentage points.

Another way of evaluating student credit accumlation is to determine the rate at which students successfully complete the credits attempted during the year.

Table 26

Percent Credits Earned of Credits Attempted By Students in Opportunity Programs, 1975-76

No. of Semesters in Program	SEEK	HEOP		EOP		College Discovery
		4 yr.	Prison & 2 yr.	State	Community Colleges	
1	52.9	70.7	51.4	68.5	55.0	67.0
2	65.0	81.1	75.5	81.2	68.3	58.6
3	55.8	65.2	72.3	77.3	72.8	62.1
4	68.0	89.0	85.2	79.3	78.4	63.9
5	64.5	82.7	74.3	81.9	74.8	62.9
6	70.5	90.3	81.0	72.2	73.0	48.9
7	71.8	80.1	69.4	90.7	95.2	57.9
8	77.5	91.4	75.3	83.0	85.6	50.1
9	76.8	86.7	85.4	85.9	93.6	43.1
10	72.2	88.4	66.4	68.3	78.7	61.4
Average	69.3	83.9	72.1	78.1	70.9	62.4
Average-2-9 Semesters	70.0	84.3	77.0	78.5	73.1	62.5

Table 26, which displays these data for all programs, shows that on the average students successfully completed 72.4% of the credits attempted. Students in the four year institutions of HEOP had a completion rate of 83.9%, while students in the College Discovery program completed 62.4% of courses attempted.

The 75-76 completion rates for SEEK, HEOP, EOP in State Operated schools, and College Discovery were higher than those for 74-75.

Graduation Rate

Table 27 presents the total number of graduates as a percent of total number of those enrolled up to 75-76.

Table 27A

Total Graduates as a Percentage of Total Students Ever Enrolled in Opportunity Programs to 1975-76

	No. of students Enrolled up to 75-76	No. of Graduates	Percent of Graduates To Enrollees
SEEK	25,887	1952	7.5
HEOP	18,491	3383	18.3
EOP			
STATE	22,578	3387	15.0
COMMUNITY	12,272	1208	9.8
COLLEGE DISCOVERY	8,194	1525	18.6
TOTALS	87,422	11455	13.1

More than 87 thousand students have participated in opportunity programs. Over 11 thousand have graduated, since the programs began. This number of graduates is 13% of the total cumulative enrollment of all opportunity programs, and represents a 1.7 percentage point increase over 74-75 figure.

Another way of measuring the graduation rate is to determine the graduates from any given class as a percent of the number enrolled in that same class.

Table 27B shows the graduation rates for students enrolled in four year programs.

Table 27B

Graduates as % of Enrollment[1]

Class by Date of Entry	HEOP	SEEK[4]	EOP-4 yr. State Operated
Fall 70[2]	43	12.1	Not Available
Fall 71[2]	40	16.6	Not Available
Fall 72[3]	31	4.4	Not Available

[1]Students transferring out of program-are not included in Enrollment.

[2]Rate after 10 semesters of study.

[3]Rate after 8.

[4]Retention and graduation of Disadvantaged Students on Senior Colleges of CUNY - Office of Program and Policy Research - City University of New York.

Retention and Separation Rates

Students leave opportunity programs before graduation for a wide variety of reasons.

Table 28 shows separations before graduation as a percent of the total headcount enrollment for 75-76. An average of 24.3% of students enrolled in all programs left without a degree. Programs in the two year colleges had higher rates of attrition than programs in 4 year institutions.

Table 28

75-76

Separations Before Graduation as a
Percent of Total Headcount Enrollment

Program	Separations as % Headcount Enrollment	Separations as % of Headcount Enrollment Transfers excluded
HEOP	19.7	17.4
SEEK	17.6	16.7
CD	36.5	33.7
EOP STATE	24.0	22.4
EOP CC	33.9	31.3
AV.	24.3	22.4

Table 29 displays the distribution of students leaving opportunity programs without graduating by reason for separation.

Table 29

Percent Distribution of Opportunity Program
Students Leaving Program Before Graduation
By Reason For Separation

Reason For Separation	HEOP	SEEK	CD	EOP State	EOP CC	Av.
Transfer	12.0	4.9	7.7	6.7	7.7	7.5
Academic Dismissal	30.0	49.2	38.8	47.3	42.9	42.7
Academic Leave of Absence	12.5	3.5	8.7	2.5	2.0	5.4
Other-Financial Medical Personal	45.5	42.4	44.7	43.5	47.3	44.4

About 44% of the students left because of financial, medical or personal problems. Almost an equal number of students were dismissed becaused of poor academic performance. Only 13% of those withdrawing from classes either obtained academic leaves, which permit continuation of studies at a later date, or transferred directly to another institution to complete their programs.

IX PROGRAM FINANCING

Sources of Funding

Opportunity programs in New York State receive their funds from several sources, the chief of which are the State itself, the Federal government, and the institutions.

New York State

The State delivers its assistance through several channels. First, it makes a separate, annual appropriation for each program. In 1975-76 the State allocated a total of $33,928,000 for 32,700 students. This meant that in comparison with 1974-75, the opportunity programs had to serve 14% more students with 4% fewer funds from this source. Table 30 compares the appropriations and numbers of students for each program for 1974-75 and 1975-76.

Table 30

	SEEK	C D	EOP-State-Operated	EOP C C	HEOP
1974-75					
Appropriation	$13,700,000	1,700,000	9,791,000	2,550,000	7,591,000
# Students	10,700	2,000	7,600	3,000	5,300
1975-76					
Appropriation	$13,300,000	1,470,000	9,587,000	1,980,000	7,591,000
# Students	11,400	4,900	7,800	3,300	5,300

Funds from the special opportunity program appropriations for HEOP, EOP in the State-operated schools, SEEK, and C D were spent for both supportive services and student financial aid. Funds from the special appropriation for EOP in the community colleges were allocated only for student financial aid.

Second, in addition to the special appropriations, New York State provides indirect financial support to opportunity programs in the public sector. In 1975-76 funds from the regular operating budgets of the sponsoring institutions paid some of the opportunity program costs for EOP, SEEK and C D. In the case of EOP, the State provided most of this money. In the case of SEEK and C D both New York City and the State were the sources of revenue. Student financial aid and supportive services were the expenditures covered by these regular operating budgets. However, in the case of College Discovery and EOP in the community colleges the amounts spent were almost exclusively for supportive services.

Finally, New York State supports the disadvantaged by contributing money directly to students through the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP). In 1975-76 only the students in HEOP and in EOP received this type of help because only independent institutions and SUNY charged tuition.

When the contributions from, the special appropriation (State), SUNY/CUNY budgets (State) and TAP (State) are totaled, it becomes apparent that the State itself is the largest single supporter of educational opportunity.

Federal Government

The Federal government, the second source of funds for opportunity programs usually provides assistance in the form of direct aid to students. In 1975-76 Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG), Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants (SEOG), the College Work Study Program (CWSP), and National Direct Student Loans (NDSL) were the chief vehicles by which federal funds were distributed to students in all programs.

Only a few institutions participating in the Educational Opportunity Program of SUNY and in the Higher Education Opportunity Program were able to acquire

federal funds for supportive services.

Institutional

While institutional funds for the public institutions came mostly from public sources, those for the Higher Education Opportunity Program came from the independent institutions participating in the program. Each school was required to provide an amount equal to at least 15% of its HEOP grant. Most contributed much more, averaging almost 80% of the grant.

Table 31 displays the sources of revenue as a percent of total expenditures. EOP in the community colleges relied most heavily on federal funds with over 68% of that program supported from that source. College Discovery, which covered 61% of its program costs with institutional funds, depended the least (18.1%) on federal assistance. All other programs fell between these two extremes.

Table 31

Source of Revenue as a Percent of Total for 1975-76 Expenditures

	Opportunity Grant	Regular Institution Funds	Federal & Other
SEEK	36.7	36.7	26.6
C D	20.9	61.0	18.1
EOP State Operated Schools	36.1	9.7	54.2
EOP Community Colleges	16.3	15.2	68.5
HEOP	24.9	19.9	55.2

Student Financial Aid

Student financial aid is a major expenditure category in all opportunity programs. The money covering this budget item is for educational costs and the living expenses for each individual student. The amount that a student needs depends on two factors, the individual's budget status and the cost of living at each institution. Elements such as a student's economic situation, marriage status and place of residence determine the budget category to which he/she is assigned. Table 3 displays the distribution of opportunity students by budget category.

Table 32

Percent of Students in Each Budget Category

	SEEK	HEOP	EOP		COLLEGE DISCOVERY
			STATE	COMMUNITY	
Dependent commuter	59.5	25.6	13.7	24.9	58.4
Dependent student resident	4.2	28.1	43.3	8.3	.3
Independent student	30.1	36.3	35.5	54.8	35.1
Married student	6.2	10.0	7.5	12.0	6.2

The cost of living at an institution depends on the amounts charged for tuition, books, room and board. These items may fluctuate widely from school to school not only because of the differences in accommodations but also because of the differences in the general cost of living in the areas surrounding the colleges.

Table 33

Distribution of Budgeted College Going Costs for Opportunity Students, 1975-76

	SEEK		HEOP 4 Yr.		EOP State		HEOP 2 Yr.		EOP Community		College Discovery	
College-going Cost for 9 Months	Amt.	%	Amt.	%	Amt.	%	Amt.	%	Amt.	%	Amt.	%
Educational	250	10.4	2965	59.9	1028	34.2	2118	54.7	830	28.1	250	10.9
Living	2146	89.6	1986	40.1	1976	65.8	1757	45.3	2122	71.9	2038	89.1
Total	2396	100.0	4951	100.0	3004	100.0	3875	100.0	2952	100.0	2288	100.0

Table 33 displays the average cost a student incurred in attending the opportunity programs for the 75-76 academic year. The fact that independent institutions charged tuitions which were higher than those in the public sector account for the large educational budgets in HEOP. The comparatively high living costs of SEEK & CD students reflect New York City's high cost of living, and the fact that EOP in the community colleges enrolled the highest proportion of married and independent students explains the large living budgets for that program.

The student's projected needs are then met by income from the sources described earlier in this chapter. This year as in previous years the average aid package was smaller than the average budget. Table 34 displays the amounts received from grants, and other types of aid included in the average aid package.

Table 34

Composition of Average Aid Per Student
1975-76

	SEEK[1]	HEOP 4 yr	HEOP 2 yr	EOP State	EOP Community	College Discovery[1]
Total grants in aid per student	1089	3517	2614	2317	1513	1113
Total, work, loans, other sources per student	106	771	522	279	338	83
Total average aid per student	1195	4288	3136	2596	1851	1196

Table 35 compares the average per student costs for each program with the average per student aid available.

[1]All grant and loan sources may not be reported.

Table 35

Average Costs Compared to Average Aid
Available to Opportunity Students, 1975-76

	SEEK	HEOP		EOP		College Discovery
		4 yr.	2 yr.	State	Community	
Total Average Aid	$1,195	$4,288	$3,136	$2,596	$1,851	$1,196
Total Average Budget	2,396	4,951	3,875	3,004	2,952	2,288
Differences:						
Unmet Needs	($1,201)	($ 663)	($ 739)	($408)	($1,101)	($1,092)

Students in SEEK, College Discovery, EOP in the Community Colleges showed large unmet needs, with deficits exceeding $1,000. Even with work and loans total costs could not be met, a fact which placed a burden on families already economically hard pressed.

Table 36 displays the distribution of student financial aid from each source of revenue.

A comparison of these data with those from 74-75 reveals that Federal aid increased for all programs, that TAP increased for all programs eligible for it, that institutional aid decreased for all and that only SEEK and EOP in state operated schools increased the amount of aid from the opportunity grant itself.

Although SEEK and College Discovery did not report institutional contrbutions on the aid distribution sheet, other financial statements from these institutions showed small amounts of regular operating budgets allocated directly to students.

Table 36

Distribution of Financial Aid/Student
From All Sources - 75-76 Academic Year

	SEEK	HEOP 4 yr.	EOP State	HEOP 2 yr.	EOP Community	College Discovery
State						
Opg.	664	744	977	527	359	529
TAP	-0-	1097	506	790	443	-0-
Loans	-0-	158	Not Given	232	Not Given	Not Given
Inst. Aid						
Grant/Waiver	NG	567	27	138	4	NG
Loans	NG	30	3	3	18	NG
Work	NG	137	12	200	1	NG
Federal Aid						
BEOG	415	709	685	737	665	508
SEOG	10	283	104	57	32	75
CWSP	66	133	40	23	57	58
NDSL	39	249	56	40	32	23
VA./SS.	*	122	89	193	186	0
Other	*	59	97	206	54	3
Total	1195	4288	2596	3136	1851	1196

*Less than $1.00

Recommendation 14: Financial aid available to the students in the various opportunity programs in every case is insufficient; gaps remain between resources (including the students' own contributions) and needs. Further, amounts contributed by students vary widely among the sectors. Program funding should be adjusted to eliminate the gaps between need and aid and to equalize the amountsdisadvantaged students are expected to contribute to their education.

In conclusion it is clear that programs are jointly supported by the institutions, the State and the Federal Government. With costs continuing to increase all 3 sources will continue to be needed if the programs are to succeed. (Tables 36)

Table 36A

1975-76 Opportunity Program Expenditures
by 3 Major Sources of Revenue

Source	Institutional[1]		State[2]		Federal[3]		Total	
Object	Thousands $	%	Thousands $	%	Thousands $	%	Thousands $	%
Supportive Service	13,316	13.6	17,920	18.3	684	.7	31,920	32.6
Student Financial Aid	5,591	5.7	22,017	22.5	38,442	39.2	66,051	67.4
Total	18,907	19.3	39,937	40.8	39,127	39.9	97,971	100

*Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

[1]Institutional contributions include contributions from Independent Institutions and New York City Share for CUNY.

[2]New York State Share includes: Opportunity Program Funds, New York State contributions to SUNY and CUNY Regular Operating Budget, and TAP.

[3]Federal Share includes: BEOG, SEOG, NDSL, CWSP, Veterans Benefits, Social Security.

Supportive Services

Supportive services constitutes the other major category included in the budgets of opportunity programs. Professional salaries, student assistant salaries, clerical and secretarial costs, remedial/developmental tuition, consumable supplies, travel, equipment, contractual and indirect expenses are all components of the supportive services section of the budgets.

Tables 37-41 show for each program both the amounts and the sources of revenue spent for each type of supportive service.

Table 42 shows total expenditures per student for supportive services and student financial aid, and the amount each source of revenue provided to pay for the supportive services.

A comparison of 74-75 with 75-76 shows that the supportive services provided by special program funds decreased for SEEK and HEOP and remained almost constant for EOP and CD. Regular program funds for this purpose decreased for SEEK, HEOP and EOP in the community colleges, and remained almost constant for EOP in state schools and for CD. Federal and other sources remained fairly constant. The net effect was a slight decrease for these services at a time when inflation was increasing costs for goods and services by 6-8%.

Recommendation 15: The State should regularly adjust amounts available to programs for supportive academic services in order to offset inflation and other justifiable cost increases.

Table 37

SEEK Expenditure Summary, 1975-76

	Program	Regular	Federal	Total
Professional Personnel	4,383,447	4,383,449		8,766,896
Employee Benefits	893,420	241,749		483,495
Student Assistants	241,746	893,420		1,786,840
Clerical & Secretarial Personnel	381,337	381,342		762,679
Employee Benefits	122,821	122,822		245,643
Consumables	17,000	17,000		34,000
Equipment	3,500	3,500		7,000
Travel				
Contractual Services	21,500	21,500		43,000
Other	47,500	47,500		95,000
SFA	$ 4,105,100	4,105,100	7,395,402	15,605,602
Totals	10,217,371	10,217,382	7,395,402	27,830,155
Each source as % of Total	36.7	36.7	26.6	

Table 38

HEOP Expenditure Summary

	Program	Regular	Federal	Total
Professional Personnel Employee Benefits	2,568,297	744,464	58,470	3,371,231
Student Assistants	410,712	75,500	81,689	567,901
Clerical & Secretarial Personnel Employee Benefits	NA	247,467	16,288	263,755
Consumables	7,626	66,331	8,092	82,049
Equipment		20,515	1,997	22,512
Travel	36,459	28,441	1,536	66,436
Contractual Services	NA	936,285	9,035	945,320
Other RDT	163,341	104,685	114,340	382,366
SFA	$ 3,969,876	3,484,478	15,587,366	23,041,720
Total	7,156,311	5,708,166	15,878,813	28,743,290
Each source as % of Total	24.9	19.9	55.2	

Table 39

EOP State-Operated Campus Expenditure Summary, 1975-76

	Program	Regular	Federal and Other	Total
Professional Personnel	1,006,821	1,283,715	201,592	2,492,128
Employee Benefits	139,941	295,982	52,809	488,732
Student Assistants	242,862	171,236	83,179	497,277
Clerical & Secretarial Personnel	1,326	296,276	27,077	324,679
Employee Benefits		57,179	19,276	76,455
Consumables		66,945	1,356	68,301
Equipment		15,128	10,842	25,970
Travel	625	24,677	2,190	27,492
Contractual Service		94,984		94,984
Other	56,152	26,711	627	83,490
SFA	$ 7,713,777	144,503	13,375,434	21,233,714
Total	9,161,504	2,477,336	13,774,382	25,413,222
Each source as % of Total	36.1	9.7	54.2	

Table 40

EOP Community-College Campus Expenditure Summary, 1975-76

	Program	Regular	Federal and Other	Total
Professional Personnel	0	949,536	36,763	986,299
Employee Benefit	0	19,717	22,880	42,597
Student Assistants	0	227,719	9,793	237,512
Clerical & Secretarial Personnel	0	154,261	20,391	174,652
Employee Benefits	0	41,281	3,184	44,465
Consumable	0	8,176	2,641	10,817
Equipment	0	4,102	24,955	29,057
Travel	0	6,628	1,647	8,275
Contractual Service	0	6,131	1,215	7,346
Other	0	56,553		56,553
SFA	$1,579,545	2,300	6,535,875	8,117,720
Total	1,579,545	1,476,404	6,659,344	9,715,293
Each Source as % of Total	16.3	15.2	68.5	

Table 41

College Discovery Expenditure Summary, 1975-76

	Program	Regular	Federal	Total
Professional Personnel	310,275	6,309,223	0	6,619,498
Employee Benefits		1,456,287	0	1,456,287
Student Assistants	incl. in prof. pers.		0	
Clerical and Secretarial Personnel	0	0		
Employee Benefits	0	0	0	
Consumables		90,621		90,621
Equipment		28,812		28,812
Travel		4,489		4,489
Contractual Service		82,862		82,862
Other		63,837		63,837
SFA	2,449,325	54,396	3,136,105	5,639,826
Total	2,759,600	8,090,527	3,136,105	13,986,232
Each Source as % of Total	19.7	57.8	22.4	

Table 42

Total Expenditures Per Student: Supportive Services Plus Tuition, Fees and Books, Plus Financial Aid Toward Living Costs For Academic Sessions

	SEEK	HEOP[4,5]	EOP		College Discovery
			State	Community	
Supportive Services[1]					
Program	575	443	190	0	72
Regular	575	374	307	438	1870
Federal & other	0	37	52	37	0
Total	1150	854	549	475	1942
Educational Costs[2]	250	2965	1028	830	250
Subtotal-Educational Expenditures	1400	3819	1577	1305	2192
Amount for Living Costs[3]	2146	1986	1976	2122	2038
Total	3546	5805	3553	3427	4230

1. Total program expenditures minus SFA
2. Tuition, fees books
3. Room board for resident students, transportation and lunches for communter.
4. 4 yr. programs
5. This amount shows decrease because HEOP subsidizes many supportive services in summer.

X CONCLUSION

In 1975-76 the opportunity programs in New York State used their limited funds to serve an increased population. The students enrolled during the year registered successes similar to those of the previous year. These are indicators of student motivation and persistence, since financial constraints made it difficult for institutions to provide financial and academic supports equal to those of previous years.

However, it is difficult to speculate how long this record can be maintained, in light of increasing costs in student expense budgets and supportive services, without concomitant increases in either program or other sources. These programs represent a large and praiseworthy public investment in the lives of our most disadvantaged population. It would be tragic to let such programs die by denying the resources they need to succeed.

XI APPENDIX

INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN NEW YORK STATE OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS, 1975-76

A. City University of New York

I. SEEK

Bernard M. Baruch College
Brooklyn College
City College
Medgar Evers College
Hunter College
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Herbert H. Lehman College
Queens College
York College

II. College Discovery

Borough of Manhattan Community College
Bronx Community College
Hostos Community College
Kingsborough Community College
Kingsborough Bilingual Institute
New York City Community College
Queensborough Community College
Staten Island Community College

B. Private Colleges and Universities

I. Four-Year Programs

Bard College
Barnard College
Canisius College
College of Mt. St. Vincent
College of New Rochelle
College of St. Rose
Colgate University
Columbia College
Columbia University-General Studies
Cornell University
C.W. Post College
Dowling College
Daemen College
Elmira College
Fordham University-Lincoln Center
Fordham University - Rose Hill
Mercy College
Molloy College
Mt. St. Mary College
Nazareth College
New York Inst. of Tech. (Old Westbury)
New York Inst. of Tech. (New York)
New York University
Niagara University
Nyack College
Pace University, New York City
Pace University, Westchester
Polytechnic Inst. Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
Rensselaer Polytechnic Inst.
Rochester Inst. of Technology

Hamilton-Kirkland Colleges
Hobart/Wm. Smith College
Hofstra University
Iona College
Ithaca College
Keuka College
LeMoyne College
Long Island University
Manhattan College
Manhattanville College
Marist College
Marymount-Manhattan College
Marymount-Tarrytown College
Daemen College
Russell Sage College
St. John Fisher College
St. John's University
St. Lawrence University
Siena College
Skidmore College
Southampton of Long Island University
Syracuse University
Union College
University of Rochester
Utica College
Vassar College
Wagner College

II. Two-Year Programs

Albany Business College
Culinary Institute of America
Elizabeth Seton College
Junior College of Albany
Mater Dei College

III. Part-time and Prison Programs

Junior College of Albany at Coxsackie Correctional Institute
Marist College at Green Haven Correctional Facility
Malcolm-King: Harlem Extension
New York Institute of Technology (Old Westbury)
Niagara Frontier/Attica
University College of Syracuse
University Without Walls of Skidmore College at Comstock Correctional Facility

C. State University of New York

I. State-Operated Campuses

a. University Center

Albany
Binghamton
Buffalo
Stonybrook

b. University Colleges

Brockport
Buffalo
Cortland
Fredonia
Geneseo
Purchase/Mt. Vernon
New Paltz
Old Westbury
Oneonta
Oswego
Plattsbury
Potsdam
Purchase
Syracuse
Utica-Rome

c. Specialized Colleges

College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Maritime College at Fort Schuyler
Statutory College at Cornell University
Upstate Medical Center

d. Agricultural and Technical Colleges

Alfred
Canton
Cobleskill
Delhi
Farmingdale
Morrisville

II. Community Colleges

Auburn
Clinton
Finger Lakes
Corning
Dutchess
Erie, City Campus
Erie, North Campus
Fashion Institute of Technology
Fulton-Montgomery
Genesee
Herkimer
Hudson Valley
Jamestown
Jefferson
Mohawk Valley
Monroe
Nassau
Niagara
Onondage
Orange
Rockland
Schenectady County
Suffolk County
Sullivan County
Ulster County
Westchester